



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,659	02/23/2004	Dac-Sik Oh	2621	2345
28005	7590	10/24/2006	EXAMINER KIM, WESLEY LEO	
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/784,659

Applicant(s)

OH, DAE-SIK

Examiner

Wesley L. Kim

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9-18 and 21-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9-18 and 21-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to Amendment filed on 8/30/06.

- Claims 1, 10-11, and 22 are currently amended.
- Claims 7-8 and 19-20 are cancelled.
- Claims 25-27 are newly added.
- Claims 1-6, 9-18, and 21-27 are pending in the current Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/30/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant argues that a previously stored path plan, restricted location, and specific geographic region does not teach or suggest a registered location since the previously stored path plan, restricted location, and specific geographic region do not amount to a registered location.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Elliot teaches that the mobile device has been designated (i.e. registered) to a specific geographic region, which is where the mobile device belongs (Par.29 and Par.31). The location where the mobile device belongs is known and is an indication that the mobile device is registered to the corresponding area/region/premise.

- Newly added claims 25-27 are addressed in the rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 3, 10-13, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735) in view of Elliot (U.S. Pub. 2002/0164993 A1) and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1).

Regarding Claims 1, 10-12, and 21-22, Williams teaches the use of fixed wireless devices (Col.4:1-24, i.e. wireless fixed access units, WFAU) in a wireless local loop radiotelephone system, however Williams **is silent on** comparing a registered location of a fixed wireless device to a current location of the fixed wireless device, wherein the registered location comprises stored information indicating a customer premises where the fixed wireless device is located; responsively activating an alert at the fixed wireless device if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device and in response to the alert, changing the registered location to match the current location.

Elliot teaches locating a wireless device and comparing it with a predetermined (i.e. registered) location, to activate an alarm at the wireless device if the wireless device is not in the predetermined (i.e. registered) location (Par.29 and Par.31, if the location of the mobile phone is not within a boundary an alert signal may be sent to the wireless device) and Elliot also teaches the registered location of

Art Unit: 2617

a device comprises information indicating a customer premises of where the fixed wireless device is located (Par.29 and Par.31, the location boundary information includes where the customer should be located, i.e. premises). One of ordinary skill in the art could envision applying this general concept of locating a device and comparing the current location to a predetermined (i.e. registered) location and setting off an alarm if the device is not in the predetermined (i.e. registered) location to not only mobile wireless devices but also fixed wireless devices.

Graham teaches that it is well known in the art that as a mobile station moves from one cell to another, the cellular phone system updates a record of the MS's current location (Par.4;4-6). One of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to update the location of a device, which has been moved from its registered location, whether it is a mobile or a fixed wireless device.

To one of ordinary skill in the art it would have been obvious to modify Willaims, such that there is a comparison of a registered location of a fixed wireless device to a current location of the fixed wireless device; and responsively activating an alert if the registered location of the fixed wireless device does not match the current location of the fixed wireless device and changing the registered location to match the current location, to provide a method of appropriately routing communications to a devices' most current location after it has been moved from its original location.

With further regards to Claims 10 and 21, the fixed wireless device is a wireless local loop hub.

With further regards to Claims 11 and 22, Elliot teaches a data storage for storing a predetermined, i.e. registered, location of a fixed wireless device (Par.26-Par.29, the logic and database unit determines if a wireless device is in its predetermined location and if it isn't then it sends an alert to the wireless device); an alert mechanism at the fixed wireless device (Par.29).

Regarding Claim 3, the combination as discussed above teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 1, and Elliot further teaches performing the comparing function in a wireless carrier network (Par.26;1-3 and Par.29;1-10 and Fig.1;24, the comparing and activation is done by the logic and database unit located in the communications network) and performing the activating function at the fixed wireless device (Par.29 and Par.31, if the location of the mobile phone is not within a boundary an alert signal may be sent to the wireless device).

Regarding Claim 13, the combination as discussed above teaches all the limitations as recited in claim 12, and from Elliot who teaches that there is a logic and database unit (i.e. a computer) which determines if the wireless device is in its predetermined location, it is obvious that there must be a processor to process machine language instructions.

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735), Elliot (U.S. Pub. 2002/0164993 A1), and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1) in further view of Dupont et al (U.S. Pub. 2005/0037729 A1).

Regarding Claim 2, Williams, Elliot, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claim 1, however the combination is **silent on** performing the comparing function and the activating function at the fixed wireless device.

Dupont teaches that a mobile device can obtain a predetermined path and compare it to the current path that the mobile phone is taking and if it is different from the expected then, an alert is sent to an alertee (Par.61). Elliot teaches locating a wireless device and comparing it with a predetermined (i.e. registered) location, to activate an alarm at the wireless device if the wireless device is not in the predetermined (i.e. registered) location (Par.29 and Par.31, if the location of the mobile phone is not within a boundary an alert signal may be sent to the wireless device).

To one of ordinary skill in the art it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Elliot, and Graham, such that the comparing function and the activating function is performed at the fixed wireless device, to provide a method of lessening the workload off of the network.

3. Claims 4-5, 9, 14-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735), Elliot (U.S. Pub. 2002/0164993 A1), and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1) in further view of Takahara et al (U.S. Patent 5450613).

Regarding Claims 4 and 14-15, Williams, Elliot, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claims 1 and 11, and Elliot further teaches that an alarm is

activated if a device is not in a predetermined (i.e. registered) location however the combination **is silent on** the alert comprises a visual alert.

Takahara teaches that an alert comprises a visual alert (Abstract, i.e. lights).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Elliot, and Graham, such that the alert comprises a visual alert, to provide a user with an opportunity to see that an alert is activated.

With further regard to Claim 15, it is well known in the art that a light emitting diode is used to provide a visual alert.

Regarding Claims 5 and 17, Williams, Elliot, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claims 1 and 11, and Elliot further teaches that an alarm is activated if a device is not in a predetermined (i.e. registered) location however the combination **is silent on** the alert comprises an audible alert.

Takahara teaches that an alert comprises an audible alert (Abstract, i.e. sound).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Elliot, and Graham, such that the alert comprises an audible alert, to provide a user with an opportunity to hear an activation of an alert.

Regarding Claim 9, Williams, Elliot, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claim 1, and Elliot teaches that an alarm is activated if a device is not in a predetermined (i.e. registered) location however the combination **is silent on** the alert comprises an vibratory alert.

Takahara teaches that an alert comprises a vibratory alert (Abstract, i.e. vibrations).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Elliot, and Graham, such that the alert comprises a vibratory alert, to provide a user with an opportunity to feel an activation of an alert.

4. Claims 6, 16, 18, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735), Elliot (U.S. Pub. 2002/0164993 A1), and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1) in further view of Stoks (U.S. Pub. 2004/0038664 A1).

Regarding Claims 6, 16, 18, and 23-24, Williams, Elliot, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in Claims 1 and 11, however the combination **is silent on** wherein activating the alert comprises displaying a message to a user on a liquid crystal display.

Stoks teaches that a message is displayed on the phone as an alert (Par.115;1-4).

The examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is well known in the art that mobile phones comprise an LCD display to provide a display.

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Elliot, and Graham, such that the alert comprises displaying a message to a user on a liquid crystal display, so that the user may see exactly what is wrong in the alert message.

Art Unit: 2617

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735), Elliot (U.S. Pub. 2002/0164993 A1), and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1) in further view of Garcia Aguilera et al (U.S. Patent 5564072).

Regarding Claim 25, Williams, Elliot, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claim 11, and Williams further teaches the customer premise includes an alternating current outlet (Fig.1, homes have AC outlets) and customer premises equipment connectable to the fixed wireless device (Fig.1; landline phone is connected to fixed wireless device) however the combination **is silent on** the fixed wireless device receives power from the alternating current outlet.

Garcia Aguilera teaches that it is well known in the art that a fixed wireless device receives power from an alternating current outlet (Fig.5;4 and Col.3;61-Col.4;2).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Elliot, and Graham with Garcia Aguilera, such that the fixed wireless device receives power from the alternating current outlet, to provide a method where the fixed wireless device is operational from power received from an AC outlet instead of a battery, which could run out of power.

6. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al (U.S. Patent 5475735), Elliot (U.S. Pub. 2002/0164993 A1) and Graham (U.S. Pub. 2003/0060215 A1) in further view of James (U.S. Pub. 2005/0063519 A1).

Regarding Claims 26 and 27, Williams, Elliot, and Graham teach all the limitations as recited in claims 1 and 22, respectively, however the combination is **silent on** (i) using the fixed wireless device to place a 9-1-1 call that gets routed to a public safety answering point (PSAP), and (II) in response to placing the 9-1-1 call, conveying the changed registered location to the PSAP, whereby the current location of the fixed wireless device is conveyed to the PSAP.

James teaches using a wireless device to place a 9-1-1 call that gets routed to a public safety answering point (PSAP), and (II) in response to placing the 9-1-1 call, conveying the changed registered location to the PSAP, whereby the current location of the fixed wireless device is conveyed to the PSAP (Par.7). It is obvious that a wireless call will get routed through the fixed wireless device as can be seen in Williams (Fig.1), and the location of the wireless device conveyed to the PSAP is also the location of the fixed wireless device.

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Williams, Elliot, and Graham with James, such that (i) using the fixed wireless device to place a 9-1-1 call that gets routed to a public safety answering point (PSAP), and (II) in response to placing the 9-1-1 call, conveying the changed registered location to the PSAP, whereby the current location of the fixed wireless device is conveyed to the PSAP, to provide a method where the PSAP is provided with the current location of the user so that emergency response units, i.e. police, ambulance, or fire can respond to emergency situations at the appropriate location and not somewhere where there is no emergency.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesley L. Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-7867. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WLK



GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER